

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

ANIMAL MEDICAL CENTER
OF ORLAND PARK, INC.
on behalf of Plaintiff and
the class members defined herein,

Plaintiff,

V.

WALGREEN CO.
and JOHN DOES 1-20,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT – CLASS ACTION

MATTERS COMMON TO MULTIPLE COUNTS

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff, Animal Medical Center of Orland Park, Inc., brings this action to secure redress for the actions of Defendants, Walgreen Co. and John Does 1-20, in sending or causing the sending of unsolicited advertisements to telephone facsimile machines (Exhibit A) in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §227 (“TCPA”), the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act, 815 ILCS 505/2 (“ICFA”), and the common law.

2. The TCPA expressly prohibits unsolicited fax advertising. Unsolicited fax advertising damages the recipients. The recipient is deprived of its paper and ink or toner and the use of its fax machine. The recipient also wastes valuable time it would have spent on something else. Unsolicited faxes prevent fax machines from receiving and sending authorized faxes, cause wear and tear on fax machines, and require labor to attempt to identify the source and purpose of the unsolicited faxes.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff Animal Medical Center of Orland Park, Inc. is an Illinois corporation

with offices at 16200 S. LaGrange Road, Orland Park, Illinois, where it maintains a telephone facsimile machine that automatically prints on paper using toner/ ink.

4. Defendant, Walgreen Co., is an Illinois corporation that has its principal place of business at 108 Wilmot Rd. and 200 Wilmot Rd., Deerfield, IL 60015. Its registered agent and office is Illinois Corporation Service Co., 801 Adlai Stevenson Drive, Springfield, IL 62703. It operates numerous Walgreens pharmacies throughout the United States.

5. Defendants John Does 1-20 are other natural or artificial persons that were involved in the sending of the facsimile advertisements described below. Plaintiff does not know who they are.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1367. *Mims v. Arrow Financial Services, LLC*, 565 U.S. 368 (2012); *Brill v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, 427 F.3d 446 (7th Cir. 2005).

7. Personal jurisdiction exists because Defendants are headquartered in Illinois.

8. Venue in this District is proper for the same reason.

FACTS

9. During New Year's weekend 2021-2022, Animal Medical Center of Orland Park, Inc., received the unsolicited fax advertisement attached as Exhibit A on its facsimile machine.

10. Exhibit A was sent by Defendant Walgreen Co. to announce that various Walgreens pharmacies could fill prescriptions for the drugs listed and was sent for the purpose of inducing prescription of such drugs. The drugs are paid for by the Government. On information and belief, (a) the manufacturers (Merck and Pfizer) receive an amount equal to about \$500 to \$700 per prescription from the Government (with 13 to 15 million purchased) and (b) pharmacies such as Walgreens are paid to dispense them. In addition, the pharmacies obtain more customers for their existing retail and other businesses.

11. Discovery may reveal the transmission of additional faxes as well.

12. Defendants are responsible for sending or causing the sending of the faxes.
13. The fax provides a telephone number, 866-935-0867, which is answered by a recording, “thank you for calling Walgreens,” after which a pharmacy technician comes on the line.
14. Defendants either negligently or wilfully violated the rights of Plaintiff and other recipients in sending the faxes.
15. Plaintiff had not authorized the sending of fax advertisements to Plaintiff.
16. The fax does not contain opt out information.
17. On information and belief, the faxes attached hereto was sent as part of a mass broadcasting of faxes.
18. On information and belief, Defendants directed the sending of the fax advertisements and have transmitted similar unsolicited fax advertisements to at least 40 other persons in Illinois.
19. There is no reasonable means for Plaintiff or other recipients of Defendants’ unsolicited advertising faxes to avoid receiving illegal faxes. Fax machines must be left on and ready to receive the urgent communications authorized by their owners.

COUNT I – TCPA

20. Plaintiff incorporates ¶¶ 1-19.
21. The TCPA makes unlawful the “use of any telephone facsimile machine, computer or other device to send an unsolicited advertisement to a telephone facsimile machine ...” 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(C).
22. The TCPA, 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3), provides:

Private right of action.

A person or entity may, if otherwise permitted by the laws or rules of court of a State, bring in an appropriate court of that State—

(A) an action based on a violation of this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection to enjoin such violation,

(B) an action to recover for actual monetary loss from such a violation, or to receive \$500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater, or

(C) both such actions.

If the Court finds that the defendant willfully or knowingly violated this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection, the court may, in its discretion, increase the amount of the award to an amount equal to not more than 3 times the amount available under the subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

23. Plaintiff and each class member suffered damages as a result of receipt of the unsolicited faxes, in the form of paper and ink or toner consumed as a result. Furthermore, Plaintiff's statutory right of privacy was invaded.

24. Plaintiff and each class member is entitled to statutory damages.

25. Defendants violated the TCPA even if its actions were only negligent.

26. Defendants should be enjoined from committing similar violations in the future.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

27. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a) and (b)(3), Plaintiff brings this claim on behalf of a class. The class consists of (a) all persons (b) who, on or after a date four years prior to the filing of this action (28 U.S.C. §1658), (c) were sent faxes by or on behalf of Walgreen Co. or its affiliates promoting goods or services, (d) with respect to which Defendants did not have evidence of consent prior to sending the fax.

28. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that there are more than 40 members of the class.

29. There are questions of law and fact common to the class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual class members. The predominant common questions include:

- a. Whether Defendants engaged in a pattern of sending unsolicited fax advertisements;

- b. The manner in which Defendants compiled or obtained its list of fax numbers; and
- c. Whether Defendants thereby violated the TCPA.

30. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class actions and claims involving unlawful business practices. Neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel have any interests which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this action.

31. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the class members. All are based on the same factual and legal theories.

32. A class action is the superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The interest of class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendants is small because it is not economically feasible to bring individual actions.

33. Numerous courts have certified class actions under the TCPA. *Holtzman v. Turza*, 08cv2014, 2009 WL 3334909, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 95620 (N.D.Ill. Oct. 14, 2009), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part, vacated in part*, 728 F.3d 682 (7th Cir. 2013); *Ballard RN Center, Inc. v. Kohl's Pharmacy and Homecare, Inc.* 2015 IL 118644, 48 N.E.3d 1060; *American Copper & Brass, Inc. v. Lake City Indus. Products, Inc.*, 757 F.3d 540, 544 (6th Cir. 2014); *In re Sandusky Wellness Center, LLC*, 570 Fed.Appx. 437, 437 (6th Cir. 2014); *Sandusky Wellness Center, LLC v. Medtox Scientific, Inc.*, 821 F.3d 992, 998 (8th Cir. 2016); *Sadowski v. Med1 Online, LLC*, 07cv2973, 2008 WL 2224892, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41766 (N.D.Ill. May 27, 2008); *CE Design Ltd. v. Cy's Crabhouse North, Inc.*, 259 F.R.D. 135 (N.D.Ill. 2009); *Targin Sign Systems, Inc. v. Preferred Chiropractic Center, Ltd.*, 679 F.Supp.2d 894 (N.D.Ill. 2010); *Garrett v. Ragle Dental Laboratory, Inc.*, 10cv1315, 2010 WL 4074379, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108339 (N.D.Ill. Oct. 12, 2010); *Hinman v. McM Rental Center, Inc.*, 545 F.Supp.2d 802 (N.D.Ill. 2008); *G.M. Sign, Inc. v. Group C Communications, Inc.*, 08cv4521, 2010 WL 744262, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17843 (N.D.Ill. Feb. 25, 2010); *Kavu, Inc. v. Omnipak Corp.*, 246 F.R.D. 642 (W.D.Wash. 2007); *Display South, Inc. v. Express Computer Supply, Inc.*, 961 So.2d 451, 455 (La.App. 2007); *Display South, Inc. v. Graphics*

House Sports Promotions, Inc., 992 So.2d 510 (La.App. 2008); *Lampkin v. GGH, Inc.*, 146 P.3d 847 (Ok.App. 2006); *ESI Ergonomic Solutions, LLC v. United Artists Theatre Circuit, Inc.*, 203 Ariz. 94, 50 P.3d 844 (2002); *Core Funding Group, LLC v. Young*, 792 N.E.2d 547 (Ind.App. 2003); *Critchfield Physical Therapy v. Taranto Group, Inc.*, 293 Kan. 285, 263 P.3d 767 (2011); *Karen S. Little, L.L.C. v. Drury Inns, Inc.*, 306 S.W.3d 577 (Mo.App. 2010); *Lindsay Transmission, LLC v. Office Depot, Inc.*, 4:12cv221, 2013 WL 275568, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9554 (E.D.Mo. Feb. 24, 2013).

34. Management of this class action is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class actions, e.g. for securities fraud.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the class and against Defendants for:

- a. Actual damages;
- b. Statutory damages;
- c. An injunction against the further transmission of unsolicited fax advertising;
- d. Costs of suit;
- e. Such other or further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT II – ILLINOIS CONSUMER FRAUD ACT

35. Plaintiff incorporates ¶¶ 1-19.

36. Defendants engaged in unfair acts and practices, in violation of ICFA § 2, 815 ILCS 505/2, by sending unsolicited fax advertising to Plaintiff and others.

37. Unsolicited fax advertising is contrary to the TCPA and also Illinois law. 720 ILCS 5/26-3(b) makes it a petty offense to transmit unsolicited fax advertisements to Illinois residents.

38. Defendants engaged in an unfair practice and an unfair method of competition by engaging in conduct that is contrary to public policy, unscrupulous, and caused injury to recipients of their advertising.

39. Plaintiff and each class member suffered damages as a result of receipt of the

unsolicited faxes, in the form of paper and ink or toner consumed as a result.

40. Defendants engaged in such conduct in the course of trade and commerce.

41. Defendants' conduct caused recipients of their advertising to bear the cost thereof.

This gave Defendant an unfair competitive advantage over businesses that advertise lawfully, such as by direct mail. For example, an advertising campaign targeting one million recipients would cost \$500,000 if sent by U.S. mail but only \$20,000 if done by fax broadcasting. The reason is that instead of spending \$480,000 on printing and mailing his ad, the fax broadcaster misappropriates the recipients' paper and ink. "Receiving a junk fax is like getting junk mail with the postage due". Remarks of Cong. Edward Markey, 135 Cong Rec E 2549, Tuesday, July 18, 1989, 101st Cong. 1st Sess.

42. Defendants' shifting of advertising costs to Plaintiff and the class members in this manner makes such practice unfair. In addition, Defendants' conduct was contrary to public policy, as established by the TCPA and Illinois statutory and common law.

43. Defendants should be enjoined from committing similar violations in the future.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

44. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a) and (b)(3), Plaintiff brings this claim on behalf of a class. The class consists of (a) all persons with Illinois fax numbers (b) who, on or after a date 3 years prior to the filing of this action (815 ILCS 505/10a), (c) were sent faxes by or on behalf of Walgreen Co. or its affiliates promoting goods or services, (d) with respect to which Defendants did not have evidence of consent prior to sending the fax.

45. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that there are more than 40 members of the class.

46. There are questions of law and fact common to the class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual class members. The predominant common questions include:

- a. Whether Defendants engaged in a pattern of sending unsolicited fax advertisements; and
- b. Whether Defendants thereby engaged in unfair acts and practices, in violation of the ICFA.

47. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class actions and claims involving unlawful business practices. Neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel have any interests which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this action.

48. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the class members. All are based on the same factual and legal theories.

49. A class action is the superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The interest of class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendants is small because it is not economically feasible to bring individual actions.

50. Management of this class action is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class actions, e.g. for securities fraud.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the class and against Defendants for:

- a. Appropriate damages;
- b. An injunction against the further transmission of unsolicited fax advertising;
- c. Attorney's fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit;
- d. Such other or further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT III – CONVERSION

51. Plaintiff incorporates ¶¶ 1-19.

52. By sending Plaintiff and the class members unsolicited faxes, Defendants converted to their own use ink or toner and paper belonging to Plaintiff and the class members.

53. Immediately prior to the sending of the unsolicited faxes, Plaintiff and the class

members owned and had an unqualified and immediate right to the possession of the paper and ink or toner used to print the faxes.

54. By sending the unsolicited faxes, Defendants appropriated to their own use the paper and ink or toner used to print the faxes and used them in such manner as to make them unusable. Such appropriation was wrongful and without authorization.

55. Defendants knew or should have known that such appropriation of the paper and ink or toner was wrongful and without authorization.

56. Plaintiff and the class members were deprived of the paper and ink or toner, which could no longer be used for any other purpose. Plaintiff and each class member thereby suffered damages as a result of receipt of the unsolicited faxes.

57. Defendants should be enjoined from committing similar violations in the future.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

58. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a) and (b)(3), Plaintiff brings this claim on behalf of a class. The class consists of (a) all persons with Illinois fax numbers (b) who, on or after a date 5 years prior to the filing of this action, (c) were sent faxes by or on behalf of Walgreen Co. or its affiliates promoting goods or services, (d) with respect to which Defendants did not have evidence of consent prior to sending the fax.

59. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that there are more than 40 members of the class.

60. There are questions of law and fact common to the class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual class members. The predominant common questions include:

- a. Whether Defendants engaged in a pattern of sending unsolicited fax advertisements; and
- b. Whether Defendants thereby converted the property of Plaintiff.

61. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. Plaintiff has

retained counsel experienced in handling class actions and claims involving unlawful business practices. Neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel have any interests which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this action.

62. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the class members. All are based on the same factual and legal theories.

63. A class action is the superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The interest of class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendants is small because it is not economically feasible to bring individual actions.

64. Management of this class action is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class actions, e.g. for securities fraud.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the class and against Defendants for:

- a. Appropriate damages;
- b. An injunction against the further transmission of unsolicited fax advertising;
- c. Costs of suit;
- d. Such other or further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT IV – TRESPASS TO CHATTELS

65. Plaintiff incorporates ¶¶ 1-19.

66. Plaintiff and the class members were entitled to possession of the equipment they used to receive faxes.

67. Defendants' sending Plaintiff and the class members unsolicited faxes interfered with their use of the receiving equipment and constitutes a trespass to such equipment. *Chair King v. Houston Cellular*, 95cv1066, 1995 WL 1693093 at *2 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 7, 1995) (denying a motion to dismiss with respect to Plaintiff's trespass to chattels claim for unsolicited faxes), vacated on jurisdictional grounds 131 F.3d 507 (5th Cir. 1997).

68. Defendants acted either intentionally or negligently in engaging in such conduct.

69. Plaintiff and each class member suffered damages as a result of receipt of the unsolicited faxes.

70. Defendants should be enjoined from continuing trespasses.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

71. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a) and (b)(3), Plaintiff brings this claim on behalf of a class. The class consists of (a) all persons with Illinois fax numbers (b) who, on or after a date 5 years prior to the filing of this action, (c) were sent faxes by or on behalf of Walgreen Co. or its affiliates promoting goods or services, (d) with respect to which Defendants did not have evidence of consent prior to sending the fax.

72. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that there are more than 40 members of the class.

73. There are questions of law and fact common to the class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual class members. The predominant common questions include:

- a. Whether Defendants engaged in a pattern of sending unsolicited fax advertisements; and
- b. Whether Defendants thereby committed a trespass to chattels.

74. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class actions and claims involving unlawful business practices. Neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel have any interests which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this action.

75. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the class members. All are based on the same factual and legal theories.

76. A class action is the superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The interest of class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendants is small because it is not economically feasible to bring individual actions.

77. Management of this class action is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties that those presented in many class actions, e.g. for securities fraud.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the class and against Defendants for:

- a. Appropriate damages;
- b. An injunction against the further transmission of unsolicited fax advertising;
- c. Costs of suit;
- d. Such other or further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

/s/ Daniel A. Edelman
Daniel A. Edelman

Daniel A. Edelman
Dulijaza (Julie) Clark
EDELMAN, COMBS, LATTURNER & GOODWIN, LLC
20 S. Clark Street, Suite 1500
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 739-4200
(312) 419-0379 (FAX)

/s/ Frank F. Owen
Frank F. Owen
Florida Bar No. 0702188

Frank F. Owen
FRANK F. OWEN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
1091 Ibis Avenue
Miami Springs, Florida 33166
(305) 984-8915
FFO@Castlepalms.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Animal Medical Center
of Orland Park Inc. and all others similarly situated

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands trial by jury.

/s/ Daniel A. Edelman
Daniel A. Edelman

Daniel A. Edelman
Dulijaza (Julie) Clark
EDELMAN, COMBS, LATTURNER & GOODWIN, LLC
20 S. Clark Street, Suite 1500
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 739-4200
(312) 419-0379 (FAX)

/s/ Frank F. Owen
Frank F. Owen
Florida Bar No. 0702188

Frank F. Owen
FRANK F. OWEN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
1091 Ibis Avenue
Miami Springs, Florida 33166
Tel: (305) 984-8915
FFO@Castlepalms.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Animal Medical Center
of Orland Park Inc. and all others similarly situated

NOTICE OF LIEN AND ASSIGNMENT

Please be advised that we claim a lien upon any recovery herein for 1/3 or such amount as a court awards. All rights relating to attorney's fees have been assigned to counsel.

/s/ Daniel A. Edelman
Daniel A. Edelman

Daniel A. Edelman
Dulijaza (Julie) Clark
EDELMAN, COMBS, LATTURNER & GOODWIN, LLC
20 S. Clark Street, Suite 1500
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 739-4200
(312) 419-0379 (FAX)

/s/ Frank F. Owen
Frank F. Owen
Florida Bar No. 0702188

Frank F. Owen
FRANK F. OWEN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
1091 Ibis Avenue
Miami Springs, Florida 33166
Tel: (305) 984-8915
FFO@Castlepalms.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Animal Medical Center
of Orland Park Inc. and all others similarly situated

DOCUMENT PRESERVATION DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby demands that Defendants take affirmative steps to preserve all recordings, data, documents, and all other tangible things that relate to Plaintiff, the events described herein, any third party associated with any fax, telephone call, campaign, account, sale or file associated with Plaintiff, and any account or number or symbol relating to them. These materials are likely very relevant to the litigation of this claim. If Defendants are aware of any third party that has possession, custody, or control of any such materials, Plaintiff demands that Defendants request that such third party also take steps to preserve the materials. This demand shall not narrow the scope of any independent document preservation duties of the Defendants.

/s/ Daniel A. Edelman
Daniel A. Edelman

Daniel A. Edelman
Dulijaza (Julie) Clark
EDELMAN, COMBS, LATTURNER & GOODWIN, LLC
20 S. Clark Street, Suite 1500
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 739-4200
(312) 419-0379 (FAX)

/s/ Frank F. Owen
Frank F. Owen
Florida Bar No. 0702188

Frank F. Owen
FRANK F. OWEN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
1091 Ibis Avenue
Miami Springs, Florida 33166
Tel: (305) 984-8915
FFO@Castlepalms.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Animal Medical Center
of Orland Park Inc. and all others similarly situated

EXHIBIT A

Walgreens

Dear Provider,

Walgreens will be partnering with the state/jurisdiction department of health in the Federal Retail Pharmacy Therapeutics Program to dispense oral COVID-19 antiviral medications, Molnupiravir and Paxlovid.

At this time, supply continues to remain limited. Until a federal therapeutics locator is available, many states have stood up online resources to identify partner pharmacy locations.

Given the time sensitive nature of starting patients on therapy, Walgreens wanted to provide you a list of locations where we **may** have these drugs in stock in IL (below) as of 12.30.2021.

In addition, **provider offices only** may contact Walgreens representatives at **(866) 935-0867** to help identify stores with these drugs in stock in your state.

Thanks for all you and your teams have been doing during this public health crisis. Best wishes for a happy and healthy new year!

Be Well,

Walgreens

COVID-19 Oral Antiviral Locations in IL as of 12.30.2021			
STORE NUMBER	PRODUCT	STORE NUMBER	PRODUCT
3929	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	4151	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
4602	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	5056	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
4978	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	9439	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
5234	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	5124	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
3395	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	5088	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
4233	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	5139	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
3995	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	5711	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
13454	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	12787	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
10718	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	5752	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
10800	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR	4219	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR
9127	PAXLOVID + MOLNUPIRAVIR		